DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 559 SO 010 075

AUTHOR Bock, John C.; Papagiannis, George J.
TITLE The Demystification of Nonformal Education: A Critique and Suggestions for a New Research Direction. Issues in Nonformal Education, No. 1.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. Center for International Education.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 39p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for International Education, Hills House South, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003 ($2.00 paperbound)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Factors; Educational Research; Educational Theories; *Nonformal Education; *Research Criteria; Research Needs; *Research Problems; Social Attitudes; *Social Factors; Social Influences; Social Science Research; *Theories

ABSTRACT

The study of nonformal education is recast into a broader contextual framework so as to better understand its potential, limitations, and significance. Emphasis is on considering commonalities in nonformal education, as well as its differences from schooling, in relation to processes of social change. The paper considers nonformal education from an analytical and conceptual perspective rather than from a practioner's perspective. The present set of assumptions regards nonformal education from a human deficit view and sees it as effecting social change through raising consciousness and comptetence. What must be realized is that nonformal education is a social product interpenetrating and interacting with other social domains. The need is for a shift in emphasis from an overly psychological view toward a more balanced view that would include societal factors. For example, the context within which nonformal education takes place must be taken into account; its definition will vary from revolutionary to nonrevolutionary, and underdeveloped to developing environments. Research must examine the social attributes of nonformal education including (1) its recruitment, management, and mobility function; (2) its internal features; (3) and its societal charter, that is, its institutional definition. Suggestions include the formation of an agency which possesses socialization functions and serves as a system of social exchange. (KC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143559

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Judson Haverkamp

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS"

THE DEMYSTIFICATION OF NONFORMAL EDUCATION: A Critique and Suggestions for a New Research Direction

by

John C. Bock
and
George J. Papagiannis

Issues in Nonformal Education, No. 2

SP 010 075

Center for International Education
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts
1976

c John C. Bock
George J. Panagiannis

Copies are available from
Center for International Education
Hills House South Rm 287
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Mass 01002
U.S.A.

ISSUE PAPERS SERIES

Issue Papers are a series of monographs written by and for theorists and practitioners in the field of non-formal education. Ranging broadly over ethical, theoretical and practical issues in non-formal education, the series was designed to reflect the current conceptual state of the art, its pitfalls and potentialities, and to focus attention on fundamental philosophic and behavioral tenets of the field.

Papers are accepted for consideration from persons both within and without the Center for International Education and are selected on the basis of their breadth of scope, depth of analysis and freshness of perspective. The editors reserve the right to abridge manuscripts of inappropriate length and will submit page proof to authors upon request. Papers not selected will be returned to authors with readers' comments.

A periodic list of papers constituting the series will be issued to facilitate requests for desired copies. Reissues or deletions from the list will be determined on the basis of demand or estimates of the paper's continuing utility.

Views expressed in these papers are the author's and should not be considered to represent the views of the Center for International Education.

Manuscripts and requests for copies should be sent to: Publications Assistant, Center for International Education, Hills House South, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass. 01003. Full payment should be included with orders for documents.

THE DEMYSTIFICATION OF NON-FORMAL EDUCATION:

A Critique and Suggestions for a New Research Direction

by

John C. Bock

and

George J. Papagiannis

Introduction

> . . . if the aim of these programmes /adult education/ is to provide . . . knowledge and . . . skills, they may have had some success, but if their goal is to change psychological and sociological attitudes, the results are meagre; if the goal is the acquisition of privileges previously denied to the majority, some progress is visible, but if the goal is liberation of individuals and the deepening of their awareness, much more has to be achieved; if /they/ should enable individuals to adapt themselves to society and to new technologies, many programmes can claim tangible achievement, but if they aim at a real change of the status of those who have been "marginalized," the outcome is poor; if the role of adult literacy programmes is to initiate millions to the 3 R's, some results have been evident; but if their purpose includes the preparation of illiterates for a different working and social role and responsibility . . . the results are far from these objectives.[1]

Most of the wide variety of educational activities that comprise non-formal education are, of themselves, not particularly new. Trade training centers, on-the-job training, management training, "morals or political" re-education, community development programs, literacy programs and even alternative schools have been with us for some time. What is new is the development educator's attempt to reconceptualize non-schooling education and its aims so as to harness what potential it might

have for social change and socio-economic development. Non-formal education as a term represents an important change in outlook or perspective among educators, concerned governments and social scientists, rather than an emergence of a new educational phenomenon.

There are many reasons for this renewed interest in and growing stress on non-formal education among development planners and educational policy makers. Some have turned to non-formal education because it appears to hold educative promise while remaining cost-effective, compared to schools. It is believed by those who hold this view that even if one were to continue to reform, reorient and expand school systems that the wide variety of educational needs could not be met. Only through non-formal education could you meet the educational needs not fulfilled by schools and still remain within already strained national budgets.[2] Others have witnessed the educational experiments conducted by revolutionary societies such as Russia, Cuba and China which challenge the assumptions concerning the separation of "mental" and "manual." Their apparent success in minimizing the mobility management function of education has appealed to educational reformers who desire to "democratize" the educational experience and its availability.[3] Another reason appears to be that the accelerative thrust of current technological change has created a situation whereby people are required to pursue purposive education throughout most of their lives.

Non-formal education to some is increasingly perceived as a potentially powerful means for promoting dramatic economic

growth in rural areas while others perceive it as accelerating political participation and social development. Educators and social scientists view this last factor as most important in the democratization and development efforts of feudal and recently decolonized societies.[4] Political Scientists and Anthropologists have recently reported attempts by emerging nations and revolutionary societies to mobilize their citizens toward full political participation by dramatically altering their belief systems through non-formal education.[5]

It is our intention in this article to further explore this currently fashionable educational phenomenon referred to as "non-formal education" and to offer an alternative interpretive perspective by which we can more fully understand the consequences of this educational variant. It is our contention that a broader, more contextual analysis of non-formal education will enable us to understand better the current as well as the potential role of non-formal education in its relationship with social and political development. Such a perspective will enable us to focus not only on the learning environment (i.e., the internal structural features) of non-formal education but on the societal context in which it is embedded. We assume that all forms of education--non-formal as well as schooling--occur in a socio-politico-economic context and that this context, representing the other institutional domains of society, largely determines the extent to which non-formal educative agencies are successful in conveying both their cognitive and non-cognitive "messages" to their clients.

Underlying this notion is the contention that non-formal education is not a unique phenomenon that requires for its evaluation or investigation new methodologies, new theories, etc. But, rather, it is but another aspect of the spectrum of purposive educative phenomena and as such lends itself to research models and present social science knowledge which has already been accumulated, developed and tested.

Current Perspectives

This is not, by any means, the first attempt to deal with non-formal education in analytical and conceptual rather than in practitioners' terms. Philip H. Coombs, advocating a greater emphasis be put on non-formal education as part of a rural development strategy, has already conducted worldwide surveys designed to highlight current practices in adult education and training.[6] The way Coombs views it, schooling is unable to meet the educational or learning needs of the rural poor of the world. Non-formal education, serving as a substitute or a complement to schooling, with proper implementation, design and planning could serve to alleviate this "educational deprivation" and thus contribute to rural transformation.[7] He calls for massive support of this development effort and worldwide mobilization of resources on behalf of this educational innovation. Moreover he calls for research efforts to fill "knowledge gaps" so that planners and decision-makers can plan and implement non-formal education more surefootedly.

With the support of international development agencies,

several well organized research and program development efforts have already been initiated. Of particular note are the program efforts of the University of Massachusetts Nonformal Education Center and research efforts at Michigan State University's Institute for International Studies in Education. The Nonformal Education Center stresses materials development (in close cooperation with those being served), non-formal education personnel training, program design, implementation and evaluation.[8] Their approach reflects most directly the previous work of Coombs and to some extent the Illich, Freire, Everett critiques of education in developing societies.[9]

The most comprehensive research effort, however, has been initiated at Michigan State University. In cooperation with the Agency for International Development, task forces have been set up comprised of scholars and graduate students who have attempted to explore, conceptually as well as practically, various critical issues concerning non-formal education. Noteworthy are the efforts of John M. Hunter et al. who have proposed an economic analysis of non-formal education and Cole Brembeck's theoretical efforts to formulate more accurately the distinctive social structural characteristics of non-formal education learning environments.[10] Brembeck views schooling and non-formal education as two distinct learning systems each with its unique tasks to perform in the educative process. He accepts the fact that schooling will continue to dominate the educational scene[11] but that non-formal education also possesses certain distinctive characteristics--its proximity to work, immediate action and the opportunity to use

what is learned immediately--that enables it to make a unique and distinctive contribution to development in the rural areas.[12] From this view, Brembeck suggests that we develop an educational strategy that combines non-formal education and schooling, so as to draw upon the strengths of each, thus contributing to development on the broadest front possible.[13] He also cautions, however, that there is a need to develop knowledge concerning educational environments that characterize non-formal education (and schooling as well) so that policy will reflect the true potential of each.[14]

It is Philip Coombs, however, who is probably the most articulate and vociferous advocate of the positive development role of non-formal education. He first refers to the potential of non-formal education in his book, The World Education Crisis.[15] According to Coombs' analysis, the crisis of educational development in the Third World is a consequence of the fact that despite enormous expansion of educational systems since World War II there remains an unsatisfied and even increasing social demand for education. The main problems with which education is faced are: the student flood; rapidly rising educational costs; inefficient management and teaching methods; unsuitability of present output; and scarcity of resources available to educational expansion.[16] Coombs proposes that the solution to these problems include the introduction of capital intensive educational technology, improved teacher training, increased foreign aid, all for the purpose of making school more efficient, and to promote rapid expansion of non-formal education.[17] Coombs goes on to stress

that non-formal education "when well aimed, has a high potential for contributing quickly and substantially to individual and national development."[18]

Despite more recent cries for caution and more modest expectations concerning non-formal education,[19] the faith in the potential of non-formal education to serve development ends remains high. From this advocacy position, non-formal education is seen (1) as a means by which education can be provided to those for whom schooling is not a realistic alternative; (2) as a means by which new skills, attitudes are made available to the rural poor; (3) as a means to circumvent cultural obstacles that prevent some peoples from utilizing school effectively; (4) as a means by which scarce educational resources would be more efficiently utilized; and (5) as a means by which the schooling system itself is modified.[20] In that most of these functions, in one form or another, would enable more people to be educated and trained, it is assumed that individuals would become more productive and obtain higher occupational status. This would, in turn, decrease the income and status gaps between the schooled and the unschooled, the rich and poor, the rural and the urban. In this sense, non-formal education is seen as having the potential to diminish schooling's stratifying power over the schooled and non-schooled; that is, it is seen as having considerable potential for providing an alternative channel of upward social and economic mobility for low status social groups. The assumptions underlying this prospectus are essentially the assumptions that characterize the Western "developmentalist" view of education and development

in general.

This developmental model is essentially reformist, and at its heart is the conviction that the ills and disparities of society can be remedied by an increased investment in education as a means of improving the quality of "human capital"--that the gap between rich and poor social sub-groups, between developed and underdeveloped countries can be substantially diminished by well-planned educational programs. There is only minimal acknowledgement of the possibility that education itself may serve to maintain, even exacerbate, such social disparities--and, then, only formal schooling is so charged, not non-formal education.

Another assumption implicit in this model of educational development is that the socio-economic structure of a society describes a single, linear continuum, ranging from unskilled blue-collar worker or farm laborer through white-collar managerial and professional. Accompanying this human capital model of the labor force is the belief that the reason some individuals or social sub-groups persistently and systematically continue to occupy the lower rungs of this ladder is due to some "psychological or skill deficit." ("Culturally deprived" and "socially disadvantaged" are but two of the euphemisms commonly used by the liberal community to describe the concept of deficit.) In brief, this model assumes that the root cause for the problems of inequality and maldistribution of resources and statuses lies within the individual, not the social structure, and can best be remedied by prescribing more education as a cure for the "deficit." Implicit in this model is the notion of how social change occurs:

change comes about evolutionarily as a consequence of raising the consciousness and competence of individuals, through education, who in turn bring "enlightened" pressure to bear for structural reform. Within this perspective it is clear that non-formal education has become the new weapon in the development arsenal: if formal schooling can promote development, then non-formal education, through its ability to reach a broader range of people during a greater span of their lives can do it better and cheaper.

An Alternative Interpretation

But another analytical perspective based upon a different set of assumptions may result in some other conclusions and, thus, some alternative policy paradigm.

We are concerned that the overly "psychologized" mode of analysis which has characterized most Western educational thinking may not be the most useful in attempting to understand the relationship of education, as an institution, to the process of social change. We feel there is a need to develop an interpretive framework which is better able to take social structure and context into account and can, analytically, deal with the "centrality of power" in the relationship between education and the other social sub-systems. We find the implicit assumption, that severe problems of distribution and participation which arise as a result of power conflicts in other social sub-systems to be amenable to solution through the manipulation of educational variables alone, to be singularly unconvincing.

It may be that non-formal education, just as its advocates contend, does have the capacity to transform underdeveloped

societies. But before proceeding to invest in that assumption, we need to seek answers to a number of complex questions. For example, within a specific context, who benefits from investment in non-formal education? (Simply because a given program is directed at a specific sub-sector of society does not assure that that group will be the ultimate beneficiaries.) Since they are complexly interrelated, what is the nature of the interaction between schooling and non-formal education? How do they each differentially serve those social functions which education has always served--socialization, mobility management, and transmission of cognitive and non-cognitive skills? How do they differ in their patterns of recruitment? in their internal/ structural characteristics? in their relationship to the occupational structure and the world of work?

We would like to propose here an analytical paradigm which is, we feel, better suited to more rigorously seeking answers to both such macro and micro level questions as these. But such a paradigm will, of necessity, be based upon a different set of assumptions than those which underlie most of the current writing on non-formal education. First, we need to step back from the current optimism reflected by proponents of non-formal education, which assumes that the relationship between education and development, particularly non-formal education, is essentially benign. Also, contrary to the "psychological" model assumed above, we would like to construct a broader, more complex structural approach which is better designed to allow us to view education within its societal context--not as an autonomous

system, but a sub-system continually acting upon and being acted upon by the other social sub-systems--political, economic and cultural.

Moreover, we do not believe that a model which assumes that social inequality and maldistribution of resources are a consequence of individual psychological deficit, to be reformed through increased investment in education, adequately takes into account the dynamic and conflictual context of Third World nations. Indeed, to the contrary, there appears to be a growing, and convincing, body of research which raises serious questions as to the validity of the "human capital/psychological deficit" paradigm.[21]

Instead (and particularly in underdeveloped countries), the occupational opportunity structure may be more accurately described by "dual labor market segmentation."[22] Consistent with this position, the labor market is viewed as being segmented into two relatively distinct (non-linear) sectors: primary (white-collar, managerial, professional); and secondary (blue-collar labor and agricultural workers). Empirically, it is observed that there is very little mobility, or "cross-over," from the secondary to the primary sector, and that, important from our perspective, increased investment in education does not appear to significantly increase the opportunity for cross-segment mobility. Thus, it is posited that the maintenance of this segmentation (and the inequality of opportunity indicated by it) is not a consequence of individuals within the secondary segment suffering some systematic deficit, but is, rather due to systemic structural malfunction of

the entire system.[23] It cannot, therefore, be remedied simply by investment in, and manipulation of, the educational system. Indeed, it has been argued that education may serve as one of the most effective social institutions for maintaining that segmentation. This is due to the fact that: (1) formal schooling, through its selection and recruitment process, provides markedly differential elite access to the different socio-economic segments; and (2) even those relatively few members of the secondary segment who are successful in gaining access to the elite schooling track, instead of becoming "enlightened to the need for social reform," may tend to become co-opted to dominant class values and interests. Moreover, from the perspective of this analysis, if formal schooling is serving as a systems' support for the maintenance of inequality and maldistribution, then non-formal education is potentially an even more effective means for limiting cross-segment mobility.

For example, by not providing either the accepted or socially valued certification or the non-cognitive attributes necessary for continuing to learn on the job (for promotibility), non-formal education could serve to lock workers into the lower segments of the occupational structure. Needless to say, this issue could be clarified by extensive study of what the non-cognitive outcomes are in non-formal education programs and what are the effects of certification on job opportunity for non-formal education products.[24] Since it can be observed that the overwhelming majority of non-formal education programs are designed for, and directed at, the secondary (and frequently rural)

segment of the labor market, and since most of these programs have aimed at producing more competent "farmers and fishermen," it may be argued that they, more than formal schools, serve to effectively inhibit mobility between segments. (At least schools do provide the brightest of the secondary segment with some limited mobility opportunities.)

Thus, it is not difficult to understand why, from a radical or critical perspective, non-formal education is frequently viewed as a "rip-off." For if non-formal programs are successful in producing more competent, more satisfied, farmers and fishermen, they are likely to effectively defuse legitimate social discontent, and inhibit the development of concerted demand for sweeping social and economic restructuring of their society. Quite the contrary, then, of providing an alternative channel for upward socio-economic mobility, non-formal education may serve to rigidify existing channels.

Such questions concerning the relationship of social mobility or socio-economic status to education--both formal and non-formal--remain unanswered. Most of the studies, from Warner et al., Who Shall Be Educated, to Jencks et al., Inequality, have produced inconsistent evidence concerning this relationship.[25] Moreover, no one to our knowledge has yet investigated the distribution of non-formal educational opportunities. For example, to what extent are non-formal educative opportunities differentially and unequally distributed to groups in a society according to social class, ethnicity, urban-rural residence or years of schooling completed?[26] Thus, we need to ask of non-formal

education a whole range of questions that educational researchers quite routinely examine in regards to formal schooling.

The Need for Demystification

There are a number of myths concerning non-formal education (and schooling as well) that from a sociological perspective raise more questions than they answer. For example, vocational training programs in some developing countries are designed to train unemployed or underemployed farmers or peasants in modern skills. The ostensible purpose is to prepare manpower for the expanding modern industrial sector. It is a commonly articulated belief that this will in turn lead to expanded participation in not only the economic but political realm. Yet, can it really be said that the social order has changed when what has occurred is that those in the lowest rungs of traditional society have simply shifted to the lowest rungs of modern, stratified society?[27] Could it be that these kinds of educational programs contribute to rural/urban dualities; accelerate rural/urban transformation, perpetuate maldistribution of wealth and resources and maintain discontinuities that these programs were presumably designed to avoid or eradicate in the first place? A change in the occupational structure without a concurrent change in the power arrangement among different groups may be representative of the process of modernization rather than development.[28]

Non-Formal Education: Definitions and Research Directions

"Non-formal education" is an education term, not a social

scientific term or concept and, as such, tends to hold different meanings for different people. Moreover, other terms used by the same people seem to refer to the same concepts. Thus, we have considerable confusion when, on the one hand, we have one term representing diverse concepts and, on the other, one concept represented by diverse terms. While we do not deny the heuristic value of "many terms, many concepts," we do believe as Merton does that " . . . conceptual clarity is effectively marred and communication defeated by competing vocabularies . . . " We also contend that this confusion obscures the direction the research and educational planning into this pehnomenon must take.

This confusion concerning non-formal education is most likely a consequence of inadequate knowledge of and lack of research in purposive education activities carried on outside the formal school system, the lack of clear conceptualization, the different purposes it serves in differing contexts, and the different and often conflicting development assumptions that guide it.

There is also a strong tendency among educators and social scientists alike to think of education only in terms of schooling. (Many schools of education, for instance, are really schools of schooling.) Until recently most of the educational research effort has been devoted to schools and their consequences. What research has been done in out-of-school education in the past has focused on the individual learner and on the success or failure of programs on their own terms. Little or no research has been conducted that views this type of education within a contextual framework as we

will propose in this paper. Moreover, because there has been little attempt to conceptualize non-formal education in broader terms, that is, in contextual terms, there has been a tendency to compare or contrast all out-of-school educative activities in terms of their content and pedagogical methods. This has led to the belief that we can borrow, for instance, innovative ideas about education from Cuba's Parallel System[29] or from China's Spare-Time Education programs.[30]

Yet, what in fact distinguishes non-formal education as it has been conceived in the United States from programs in, say, China is not simply the observable differences in program content and implementation, but, more crucially, differences in the intervention theories which underlie such programs and the contextual realities within which these programs reside. Therefore, any explanatory framework or research model which permits us to examine the differences between non-formal education programs or between schooling and non-formal education on the basis of their internal/structural features alone is unlikely to prove adequate to the task of facilitating serious comparative research and evaluation. "Non-formal education" as an educational term is loaded with different shades of meaning, and these meanings vary according to the context; revolutary/non-revolutionary, underdeveloped/developing; and according to one's philosophical views of the role of education in general.

The term, "non-formal," is equally misleading. Non-formal suggests that there is very little or no formal structure; it suggests a highly participative, non-hierarchical and spontaneous

learning environment where all participants are both teachers and learners. Let us quote a definition of non-formal education found in Non-Formal Alternatives to Schooling: A Glossary of Educational Methods, prepared by the Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts:

> [Non-formal education] is generally seen as need-oriented, . . . utilitarian . . . and cheaper than the formal systems. Often it is tied to some productive activity . . . [is characterized by] . . . peer learning . . . and flexibility. Students, if the word be retained, generally enroll in non-formal courses because they are interested in what can be learned--not because it counts for a degree. . . . And non-formal education does not engender elitist feelings among its students.[31]

We do not, of course, deny that this definition might describe some non-formal educational activities accurately, but we do question whether it adequately describes all or even most non-formal educational activities, particularly in the developing nations. In addition, we would question the validity of some of the assumptions which underlie this conception of non-formal education because they do not dovetail with the requirements of certain types of skill training rural development or political education programs throughout the world.

It is our contention that the term, non-formal education, and its popular definitions have tended to obfuscate attempts to understand the educational activities it purports to describe and that this obfuscation has led us to minimize the commonalities and magnify the differences it shares with formal education. Although there are some promising features of non-formal education not found in schools, it would be a mistake to focus our attention on these unique features alone, particularly if the features that

are common to both types of education are of greater primacy. We do not feel that it is particularly useful simply to coin another term, even if more precise. Nor are we ready yet to offer some broader, all subsuming construct. We do feel, however, that in order to better understand this phenomenon, we should avoid too easy acceptance of conventional or currently fasionable categories. Instead, we recommend recasting the issue of non-formal education into an analytical framework that facilitates our focusing on the underlying social processes which characterize these educative activities, the social structure of these activities and its patterned effects on the experience of those who undergo the influence of these agencies. This means that we must go beyond the superficial attributes of non-formal education and examine its social attributes: (1) its recruitment-mobility-management functions (that is, the relationship between non-formal education and systems of social stratification); (2) its internal structural features; and (3) its societal charter--the institutional definition which defines the products of these agencies. It is one of our domain assumptions, than, that non-formal education, although commonly conceived as a corrective reaction against current institutional arrangements and as a solution to the problems that characterize those arrangements, is primarily a socialization agency with social features, and functions like any other socialization agency or organization.

Non-Formal Education: Socialization and Social Mobility

In order to understand more fully the need to deemphasize

the "superficial" properties of non-formal education, we must digress for a moment and reexamine our current notions of education as viewed from a sociological perspective. From this perspective, education represents those institutional arrangements and procedures by which society attempts to meet its explicit demands and requirements for competent adult participants. It is in this sense a sub-system of a broader societal process--socialization. Socialization refers to the process by which individuals acquire the knowledge, skills and properties which society demands for its maintenance or its change. In the broader sense it is that process which provides the individual with the competencies required in order to fulfill society's adult roles. "This conception . . . includes an individual's capacity to move to new statuses and to elaborate new roles."[32] It includes all learning that is purposive as well as incidental or indirect.

Education, then, is that specialized set of social arrangements which specifies and delineates the socialization process and which subsumes all learning that is purposive and direct. It includes all that is learned through instruction in some skill from a specialist or the inculcation or moral values found in the tales told by village elders to children for that purpose.[33] At the same time the social arrangements themselves represent patterned experiences which convey "indirect" lessons to those who experience them.[34] These lessons might or might not be congruent with the explicit requirements or demands of the society in which these experiences occur. This means that educational

institutions carry out explicit didactic directives but that the structures of those institutions and the relationship of educational institutions to other institutional domains[35] constitute learning settings in and of themselves which convey skills, attitudes, norms and values to those who experience them. "Just as individuals may become differently socialized because of differences in past experiences, motivations, and capacities so may they become differently socialized because of differences in the structure of the social settings in which they interact."[36]

Schooling is in effect but one instance of the institutionalized arrangements that characterize the educational process. Schools are formal organizations with very specific social features. It is a form of education which is characterized by and limited to those processes of teaching and learning carried on at specific times, in places outside the home, for definite periods, and by persons especially prepared or trained for the task. It is education which organizes its consumers by age-grading, grants certificates and degrees, and frequently requires compulsory attendance by pupils. Bidwell in his "The School as a Formal Organization" describes schools as "client-serving organizations . . . that . . . are social units specifically vested with a service function . . . the moral and technical socialization of the young."[37] In addition, the school systems are bureaucratic in structure characterized by a division of labor within the professional staff, i.e., teachers, administrators, school psychologists, and non-professional staff and between students and both types of staff. Bidwell identifies

four major characteristics of schools which make them distinctive:[38] (1) the way students are "recruited;" students enter involuntarily in age-grade cohorts; (2) the way staff are recruited; staff enter contractually as trained professionals; (3) their bureaucratic structure; and (4) the responsibility that school officers have toward their clientele and to the public constituency.

In addition, schooling as an instance of educative phenomena is characterized by diffuse goals and deferred "payoff," since students are to be socialized for adult life, and the central activities of their student role are not directly relevant to the immediate interest or lives of its incumbents. It is usually found in industrialized or industrializing societies, and its complex organization usually mirrors the complexity and form of the other institutions and structures of the society in which it is embedded. The school, its organizational structure and its diffuse goals are shaped in numerous ways and intricately connected to the other institutional domains of which it is a part.[39] Moreover, while schooling is one of the important ways by which society attempts to meet its projected competency needs, it also produces, at the same time, indirect socialization consequences as well. The organization's social charter, the institutional definition in its larger social context, also plays a role in shaping the products of this mode of socialization.[40]

Non-formal education may also be viewed as a socialization sub-system shaped by society or some aspect of it (class, subculture, political movement, etc.) in which it is embedded. It

is a contention of this paper that non-formal education is a social product interpenetrating and interacting with the other institutional domains of the society in which it resides. And although many of its specific attributes may differ from schooling, such as its organizational character, or its role structure, the overall socialization functions it serves are similar. It serves to provide those who undergo its processing with the competencies required by that society, "whether those competencies represent the traditional fixed repertoire of statuses or roles of that given socio-cultural system or an emerging repertoire of new statuses and roles."[41] It remains to be seen, however, to what extent indirect socialization occurs within this learning system (indirect socialization as in schooling refers to the unplanned learning that takes place).

There are several additional assumptions which will help to place this discussion in a more comprehensive framework. First, like school, non-formal education is consumer-oriented and has a service function which is the moral and technical socialization of people. This assumption is somewhat less restricted than the one for schools in that while non-formal education is primarily directed at adults, it can include the young as well. It follows that non-formal education prepares its youthful participants for adult statuses and roles and its adult participants for new statuses and roles.

It is also assumed that the goals of non-formal educative agencies are diffuse just as they are in schools. It remains, in our estimation, an empirical question, as to the extent of this

diffuseness. It has been commonly assumed by non-formal educators that what distinguishes non-formal education from schooling is its specificity of goals. We contend, however, that that has not been clearly demonstrated. There appears to be a wealth of examples which suggest that single skill (technical or cognitive) educative experiences are complemented by normative and non-cognitive dimensions. For example, the Cuban Literacy Mobilization Campaign in 1969 had clear political and social goals as well. Fagan comments:

> The literacy campaign even though it dealt in main with adults, partook fully of this philosophy /education as revolution/ of education. Skill training and civic education were tied together in a program that was intended to bring literacy and political awareness to the disadvantaged while at the same time introducing literacy workers to the hard realities of underdevelopment and backwardness.[42]

It would appear then that the assumption of specificity of goals is dependent on the socio-political context in which non-formal education occurs. It cannot be assumed that limited and specific goals alone characterize non-formal education.

It is clear, then, if the above-mentioned assumptions are accepted concerning schools and non-formal education that we have two variant forms of one overriding process--that of socialization. It presumes that, just as in formal schooling, one can approach the study and research of non-formal education in much the same way we do schooling, its processes and outcomes. Nearly all the variables which characterize the study of schooling also characterize non-formal education. One can proceed to examine the micro-level relationship of pedagogy, instructional methods, and curriculum to achievement and technical skills; or, alternatively,

it is possible to investigate the overall micro-outcomes, attitudinal as well as cognitive, and their interrelations with other sectors of society. Non-formal education must be studied within the societal context in which it occurs, as well as in terms of its content. The limited research that has been conducted thus far has tended to focus on content alone.

The Selection and Recruitment Process in Non-Formal Education

Elsewhere we have argued that just as the institutional definition of schools (i.e., their prestige, the success of their graduates, etc.) mediates the effects of the internal features (such as curriculum and teacher behavior) of the educative agency, so do the selection-recruitment procedures serve a similar mediating function.[43] In any attempt to systematically examine the question of "differential selection" for those who are "pushed" or "drawn" into non-formal education, there are crucial research questions which have not yet been adequately addressed: Are there observable, systematic differences in the selection criteria utilized to determine which participants are recruited into non-formal education programs and which ones are selected into further formal schooling? To what extent does the pattern of school failures or non-school goers represent a particular segment of the population in any given society? And, following from this, to what extent are semi-skilled or middle-level skill training programs designed to "select in" the dropouts from formal schooling? Further, how do these observed patterns vary from society to society? In Yugoslavia, for example, there

is a systematic attempt to provide workers with management training in preparation for management-coordinating roles in workers' councils in factories.[44] In the United States, on the other hand, management training, leadership-management workshops and seminars, whether formal or informal, are primarily available only to those with many years of formal schooling and who are already in positions of management.

In essence, the critical question we are asking is this: are participants systematically selected into non-formal education programs on the basis of antecedent criteria such as social class, ethnicity, rural origin or prior years of formal schooling? Moreover, if we find that this is indeed the case, do these programs prepare these systematically recruited participants with skills, values and "access" necessary to permit them to assume higher status roles in society? For if we find, for example, that non-formal programs recruit almost exclusively from the rural secondary segment of the labor force, but do not provide "status gains" for their graduates, can it be validly claimed that non-formal education offers an alternative channel for the upward mobility of low-status groups?

We believe that these questions are crucial and, as yet, unanswered. Moreover, until we obtain evidence to the contrary, we would hypothesize that non-formal education programs recruit primarily from the secondary segment, and, further, that these programs do not possess sufficient "social exchange value" to provide increased access to higher status occupations for their clients.

Thus, it might be argued that not only does non-formal education fail to provide an alternative mobility channel, it may, in fact, serve a significant "cooling out" function within developing society, acting to lower those aspirational levels heightened by exposure ot the early years of formal education and to the mass media. Nevertheless, the question as to whether non-formal education serves to transform traditional society or maintain and, even, reinforce existing disparities is an empirical one and requires further examination.

The "Exchange Value" of Non-Formal Education

Most organizational socialization research has focused on the organizational attributes of institutions and their effects on consequent diffuse changes in the attitudes and norms of the participants undergoing the socialization experience. We argue here that social institutions, such as schools or non-formal educative agencies, exert influence on their participants both as a result of their internal structural characteristics and also due to important features which are largely external to the institutions's own organization and which constitute its relationship with the larger socio-cultural system.

In the previous section we suggested the importance of those antecedent characteristics of students which link the school (or non-formal enterprise) to the larger society through the medium of "recruitment and selection." Thus, if the internal features of educative agencies may be described, metaphorically, as "the manipulation of the students' present experience," then the inclusion of antecedent factors may be viewed as the research

manipulation of their past. In this section we are particularly interested in how educative agencies--both formal and non-formal--may be seen as exerting powerful socializing effect upon their clients by dint of their perceived control over potential career futures. This class of independent variable, which links the educational institution forward over time to the external adult occupational structure, we describe as anticipatory.

We are particularly interested, here, in how students' perceptions about how particular educative agencies are able to enhance or inhibit the attainment of desired future occupational statuses may in important ways determine that agency's "power" to socialize its clients to institutionally desired values and norms. Thus, we view both schools and non-formal educational agencies as institutions of "social exhange"--the exchange "value" (or socializing power) being to an important extent determined both by students' perceptions of the agency's power to offer and implement desired futures and by how well the linkage between the educational institution and the occupational structure is actually articulated.

To the extent that this contextual variable has been operationalized as a perception of participants undergoing processing, we might anticipate that if the student finds, upon graduation, that the adult opportunity structure differs markedly from his prior perception, then the school's or program's socialization power is likely to be quite impermanent. In that the social exchange concept does not assume perfect information, could we expect differential behaviors and attitude outcomes

depending upon whether the non-formal experience has "delivered" or not? What happens to the newly acquired attitudes of participants if their perception of the exchange value of their education changes during the processing as a result of, say, new information? In one case, Stinchcombe argues in his book, Rebellion in a High School, that expressive alienation can be explained by poor articulation of current activity in the school with the future perceived status outside the school.[45] He found that the worse the articulation between school activities and future work roles, the more likely students would be alienated (although not necessarily rebellious). Similarly, in his study of Malaysian secondary students, Bock found if students perceived that the schools possessed high exchange value, while, in fact, the actual articulation with the world of work was poor, alienation, even turbulence, resulted.[46] Similarly, we might expect adults to become alienated in non-formal educational programs if there is poor articulation. If their expectations are modified downward (while their aspirations remain high), they may be expected to drop out or exit prior to the completion of the program. On the other hand, if they have completed the program and encounter unanticipated difficulty locating desired employment, then alienation and discontent might very well occur. One could argue, however, that since the "payoff" in non-formal education programs is both more immediate and more limited (as opposed to the deferred, but more substantial rewards of completing formal schooling), there is less tendency for such discontent to develop in the first place. In short, there would be far less disjunctive,

potentially alienating, disparity between the clients' perception of what a non-formal education program can do and what the program actually delivers than is the case with schooling.

Summary

In this paper we have tried to recast the study of non-formal education into a broader contextual framework so as to better understand the potential, the limitations and significance of this educative phenomenon. We have attempted to show that in order to measure its effects we must draw upon or develop some middle-level theoretical framework that will enable us to focus on the underlying social features of non-formal education. We have suggested that it might be fruitful to conceive of a non-formal educative agency (or a system of non-formal agencies) as social organizations which, in common with formal educational institutions, possess important socialization functions, and, in addition, serve as systems of social exchange.

It has been posited that non-formal educative agencies, again in common with schools, have internal features that contribute to the shaping of their clients' attitudes, beliefs and values, but the effects of these features are mediated by the institutional definition of the products of the agency and by the selection criteria applied to the recruitment of participants. While we see the value in those studies which have concentrated on the curriculum or the learning environment of non-formal education, it is important to be cognizant of the fact that such internal features are constantly mediated by such contextual variables as the antecedent nature of the participants, the social prestige of

the educative agency and the external occupational opportunity structure. It was also pointed out that if non-formal education studies are going to be conducted across cultures, the context in which these activities occur must be taken into account. For example, we might suggest that non-formal education in revolutionary societies may serve different socialization and mobility management functions than in pre-revolutionary societies.

Finally, it is hoped that this discussion will help us shift our research emphasis from an overly psychologized view of human development and toward a more balanced view that includes societal factors as well. The human deficit approach is not completely inadequate, it is merely deficient.

If we have seemed to be overly critical of the advocacy position regarding non-formal education, it is simply that we are not yet persuaded that this educational phenomenon comprises a bold, imaginative new appreach to the problems of underdevelopment.

Endnotes

[1]A. Delcon, "Adult Education As A Corrective To Failing Formal Education," Literacy Discussion 6 (Autumn 1975):90-91.

[2]Philip Coombs, "Outline of Research Project on Nonformal Education for Rural and Agricultural Development" (International Council for Educational Development, Jan. 1, 1971), p. 1.

[3]Joseph Lauwerys and David G. Scanlon, "Education Within Industry," The World Year Book of Education (London: Evans Brothers Limited, 1968).

[4]Richard R. Fagen, The Transformation of Political Culture In Cuba (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1969), Chapters 1 and 3; Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970); Stanley Grabowski, ed., Paulo Freire: A Revolutionary Dilemma For the Adult Educator (New York: Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education, Nov. 1972).

[5]Most of these educational activities appear to be serving "social mobilization" functions and some appear to be serving the functions of "revitalization." Mobilization denotes a concept that brackets together a number of specific processes of change such as changes in residence, or occupation, and of social setting while revitalization describes a process which seeks to reorder the fundamental patterns of belief in society. See Karl W. Deutsch, "Social Mobilization and Political Development," The American Political Science Review 55 (Sept. 1961); Fagan, Transformation of Political Culture; Anthony F.C. Wallace, "Revitalization Movements," American Anthropologist 58 (April 1956); Rolland G. Paulston, "Cultural Revitalization and Educational Change in Cuba," Comparative Educational Review, October 1972, pp. 474-485; see also Ward H. Goodenough, "Revitalization Movements in Community Development," in Cooperation in Change (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963), pp. 286-321.

[6]Philip H. Coombs et al., New Paths To Learning for Rural Children and Youth (prepared for UNICEF by International Council for Educational Development, October 1973).

[7]Ibid., p. 22.

[8]Nonformal Education Center Brochure (University of Massachusetts, The Center for International Education, 1975).

[9]Non-Formal Alternatives To Schooling: A Glossary of Educational Methods (University of Massachusetts, The Center for International Education, 1971).

[10]Cole S. Brembeck, "The Strategic Uses of Formal and Non-Formal Education," (paper prepared for the SEAMES/SEADAG and Korea/SEADAG seminars, October 1971, mimeographed); John M. Hunter et al., Study Team Reports: Economics of Non-Formal Education (East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for International Studies in Education, Michigan State University, 1974).

[11]Ibid., p. 3.

[12]Ibid., p. 2.

[13]Ibid., p. 4.

[14]Ibid., p. 4.

[15]Philip H. Coombs, The World Education Crisis (New York: Oxford Press, 1968).

[16]Ibid., pp. 164-165.

[17]Ibid., pp. 168-170.

[18]Ibid., pp. 138; 142-144.

[19]Thomas J. La Belle and Robert E. Verhine, "Nonformal Education and Occupational Stratification: Implications for Latin America," Harvard Educational Review 45 (May 1975). See also Brembeck, "Strategic Uses," and Martin Carnoy, "The World Education Crisis: A Systems Analysis: A Review," Harvard Education Review 44 (February 1974):178-187.

[20]Deleon, "Adult Education," pp. 84-103.

[21]Nathan Caplan and Stephen D. Nelson, "On Being Useful: The Nature and Consequences of Psychological Research on Social Problems," American Psychologist 28 (March 1973):199-211.

In this article Caplan and Nelson explicate the inherent dangers of this "over-psychologized" view toward human development. They point out that the preoccupation of social scientists with person-centered variables leads to "person-blame" casual attribution bias. This bias serves several functions:

1. It displaces blame for prior political and technological failures on to the poor.

2. It reinforces social myths about one's degree of control over his own fate.

3. It leads to person-centered "treatment" rather than institutional or system "treatment" in efforts to understand poverty.

4. It encourages and justifies continued study of the poor rather than the rich.

See also La Belle and Verhine's criticism of the Technical-Function theory in "Nonformal Education." They argue that skill attainment might not be the central ingredient in the process of status attainment; pp. 179-180.

[22]Michael Carter and Martin Carnoy, "Theories of Labor Markets and Worker Productivity" (Discussion paper, Center for Economic Studies, P.O. Box 3736, Stanford, CA 94305, August, 1974); see also Richard C. Edwards et al., eds., Labor Market Segmentation (Lexington: D. C. Heath, 1973); in particular see Michael J. Piore's "Notes from a Theory of Labor Market Stratification," pp. 125-150; and Richard C. Edwards, "The Social Relations of Production," pp. 3-26.

[23]Herbert Gintis, "Education, Technology and Characteristics of Worker Productivity," American Economic Review, May 1971, pp. 266-279.

[24]Studies that have investigated the non-cognitive effects of non-formal education indicate that the challenge of the "unorthodox" socializing setting of non-formal education is not beyond the research models that have already been developed and tested. See "Some Psychological Effects and Non-effects of Literacy in a New Nation," Howard Shuman, Alex Inkeles and David N. Smith (Report of the Project on Social and Cultural Aspects of Development, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, 1967); also, F. B. Waisanen, "Individual Modernity and Non-Formal Education" (paper presented on "New Strategies for Educational Development: Non-Formal Alternatives," Academy of Science, Washington, D. C., May 13-15, 1971); also Howard Shuman, "Economic Development and Individual Change: A Social Psychological Study of the Comilla Experiment in Pakistan" (Occasional Papers in International Affairs 15, 1967, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University). Other recent studies include George Papagiannis' "Nonformal Education and National Development: The Institutional Affects of the Thai Mobile Trade Training School on its Adult Participants" (forthcoming dissertation), and John Simons, Towards an Evaluation of Literacy and Adult Education in A Developing Country (Cambridge: UNESCO, September 1970).

[25]See Christopher Jencks et al, Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America (New York: Basic Books, 1972); W. Lloyd Warner et al., Who Shall Be Educated? (New York: Harper and Bros., 1944); Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, The American Occupational Structure (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967); Otis Dudley Duncan and Robert W. Hodge, "Education and Occupational Mobility: A Regression Analysis," The American Journal of Sociology 68:629-644; C. Arnold Anderson, "A Skeptical Note on the Relation of Vertical Mobility of Education," The American Journal of Sociology 66 (1961):560-570; Samuel Bowles,

"Schooling and Inequality from Generation to Generation," Journal of Political Economy, 1972, pp. 219-251.

See also La Belle and Verhine, "Nonformal Education," who discuss this issue comprehensively.

[26]Contrary to popular belief, many non-formal education programs require that the participants have a minimum of schooling. For example, the mobile trade training program designed to provide the rural population with middle level semi-skills requires four years of elementary school training. See Mobile Trade Training Schools 1970 Report (The Vocational Promotion Division--Department of Vocational Education, Bangkok, Thailand). Most culture and "leisure" programs found in the U.S. adult education programs are designed for participants with a minimum of high school; some even require a college education. Also see "Changing Status and Roles During the Adult Life Cycle: Significance For Adult Education," Robert H. Havighurst, Sociological Backgrounds of Adult Education, Robert W. Burns, ed. (Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1963), p. 23. Havighurst says, "Adult education today is mainly a middle-class operation."

[27]For a thought-provoking discussion of stratified and unstratified systems, see M. G. Smith, "Pre-Industrial Systems," in Neil J. Smelser and Martin Lipett, eds., Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1964).

[28]Norman Jacobs, Modernization without Development: Thailand as an Asian Case Study (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), p. 11. "Another distinction," Jacobs says, "which may be made between modernization and development is that the former can be satisfactorily termed growth. But development, although it can also be expressed quantitatively, because it is vitally concerned with the acceptance of novel interrelationships of human beings among themselves and in interaction with their environment, must be expressed qualitatively."

[29]Raul Ferrer Perez, Innovating Experiments In Education In Cuba (New York: International Commission on the Development of Education, UNESCO, 1971).

[30]Stewart Fraser and John N. Hawkins, "Chinese Education: Revolution and Development," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1972, pp. 487-500.

[31]Non-Formal Alternatives to Schooling, p. 1.

[32]Alex Inkeles, "Social Structure and the Socialization of Competence," Harvard Educational Review 36 (Summer 1966):265.

[33]Melville J. Herskovits, Man and His Works (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956). See his chapter on "Education and the Sanctions of Custom."

[34]Robert Dreeben, On What is Learned In School (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1968).

[35]John W. Meyer, The Charter: Conditions of Diffuse Socialization In Schools, Research and Development Memorandum No. 65, May 1970 (Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching), pp. 1-5.

[36]Stanton Wheeler, "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings," Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays, Orville G. Brim and Stanton Wheeler (New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1966), p. 54.

[37]Charles E. Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization," James March, ed., Handbook of Organization, pp. 973; 974.

[38]Ibid., pp. 972-1022.

[39]Meyer, The Charter, pp. 2-5.

[40]Ibid., p. 2.

[41]Inkeles, "Social Structure," p. 265.

[42]Fagen, Transformation, p. 37.

[43]John Bock, "Education and Nation Building in Malaysia: A Study of Institutional Effect in Thirty-Four Schools" (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1970), Chapter 3.

[44]M. David, Adult Education in Yugoslavia (France: UNESCO, United Nations, Monographs on Education 1, 1962).

[45]Arthur I. Stinchombe, Rebellion in a High School (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964).

[46]Bock, "Education and Nation Building."